



**Meeting Summary**  
**911 Board Standards Committee**  
**10/14/2014**  
**N.C. ITS Building**  
**3900 Wake Forest Rd**  
**Raleigh, NC**  
**10:00 AM – 1:30 PM**

<u>Standards Committee</u>	<u>Staff</u>	<u>Guest</u>
Laura Sykora, Chair (present)		
Tommy Cole (absent)	David Dodd	
Jimmy Stewart (present)	Richard Bradford	
Barry Furey (phone)	Richard Taylor	
Rodney Cates (absent)	Tina Bone	
Christy Shearin (phone)	Dave Corn	
Margie Frye (phone)		
Donna Wright (absent)		
<b><u>Enforcement Committee</u></b>		
Carson Smith (present)		
Jeff Dulin (absent)		
John Lettney (present)		
Greg Foster (present)		
Judy Jenkins (present)		
Jim Soukup (present)		

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM by Laura Sykora. Richard Taylor called the roll. Laura gave some opening comments. Dave Corn was asked to give a summary of the last meeting in order to provide continuity between meetings. The last meeting dealt almost entirely with the Compliance Process. Laura asked that the Standards Committee Compliance Process document be shown on the screen.

The Committee began discussing the Compliance Process document. Step 1 was approved with no discussion. Step 2 was then shown. The question was asked if there was a definition of infraction. The suggestion was made that an infraction would be anything less than full compliance. Carson Smith

suggested if it is a minor infraction, and the infraction is corrected within 30 days, then the PSAP would then be good for the 3 year period. The Committee agreed and language in the process was changed to reflect this.

Richard Taylor asked Richard Bradford if there needs to be a definition of certain terms added either in this document or in the Rules themselves. Richard Bradford said there needs to be definitions somewhere. The Committee then said perhaps it would be better to not use the word infraction. It was suggested that it may be better to just say a PSAP is not in compliance. Discussion followed but no alternative was agreed upon.

Richard Bradford stated that what he was looking for from the Committee was what it wanted to accomplish, how it should be accomplished, and what the anticipated impacts of the Rules are on the PSAPs. He suggested the first thing we need to do is better define 1.1, how the inspection process will occur and who will do the inspection. The Rules would go into effect at a date later than the date they were actually adopted. Richard Taylor would like to see an effective date be sometime shortly after the beginning of a new fiscal year. Carson Smith suggested perhaps doing a pre-inspection before the rule became effective. That would give PSAPs time to get into compliance before the actual go live date. Richard Taylor suggested that all PSAPs could be inspected within a 12 month period. Who actually does the inspections is still undetermined. It may require additional staff. Jim Soukup asked if the inspection process would include secondary PSAPs? Richard said yes, the secondary PSAPs would have to be included, but up to now, only 3 or 4 have expressed an interest and completed the process.

Margie Fry asked if PSAPs would have a copy of the inspection process so they could self-inspect themselves on a monthly or quarterly basis, to make sure they remain in compliance. The Committee thought this was a good idea. There was a brief discussion of consequences. The committee agreed that penalties were generally counter-productive in improving performance. Laura stated that the withholding of funds as an absolute last resort. Carson Smith asked if a smaller group of people could get together and re-write any necessary parts of this document and present it at the next Committee meeting.

Carson Smith stated that if a PSAP requires an action plan, then they will be subject to an annual inspection. If there is a non-compliance issue that can be completed/corrected within 30 days during the written response period, no action plan will be required, and the PSAP will be subject to the 3 year inspection cycle.

Tina Bone asked what would happen if staff uncovered an infraction while on a routine/non-inspection visit, what would the Committee's expectation be? Laura thought the PSAP Manager should be notified at the very least. Carson Smith asked what if a complaint was received by the media or the public? Richard Bradford discussed the consequences of inspections and how some might actually be classified as investigations, in response to complaints, and the responsibilities and liabilities involved. The Committee decided to add a 1.4 section defining Inspections for Cause.

Richard Bradford said the statement of discretion in 2.3 will not make it through the Rules process. It can remain in the policy and procedure process, but it will not work in the Rules process. The Committee decided to delete the last sentence of 2.2. In 2.4, the question was asked if the Inspector has the authority to approve action plans. Richard Bradford said no. The Board has that authority, and they could delegate but generally they have only done this to the Executive Director. Judy Jenkins suggested saying in 2.4 the Action Plan will be submitted to the 911 Board for approval. The Committee

recommended that 2.5 be removed altogether. In 2.6, it was recommended to replace Inspector or staff with Executive Director.

The Committee thought section 3 was a repeat of some of the parts of Section 2. It was agreed to remove and/or merge parts of Section 3. 3.2 was incorporated into 2.4.

In 4.1, the words “problem” and “formally” will be taken out. In 4.2 change the word “agree” to “find.”

Richard Bradford gave an update on the Rules Review process. He and Teresa Banks met with attorneys for the Rules review process. Much debate ensued. The OAH does not think the Board has the authority to establish training requirements in the Rules document.

Richard then reviewed the Rules process. Once the current issues are addressed, the draft will be published for public review. The Board will hold a public hearing, and the comments from that hearing will be sent to Rules Review. Laura asked what are the next benchmarks in the process? Richard Bradford said we have to first finish the internal process. He said scheduling has been difficult with OAH because of volume and staffing issues. Richard asked about the OAH concern of the training requirements in the Rules? Richard Bradford said there is not statutory backing to require training, and the training piece will not make it through the Rules process. The List of Approved Training Classes is an approved policy, but the Board does not have the statutory authority to require 16 hours of annual continuing education. The question was asked if the 911 Board paid for people, would they be able to mandate training, and Richard Bradford said yes.

Laura then turned to a discussion on the Checklist for Inspectors. Dave Corn went through the revised Rules as provided by Richard Bradford. After a few comments, the Committee decided because Richard Bradford indicated the current draft Rules would probably change, it might be best to table this discussion until the Rules are more finalized.

Laura mentioned to the Committee that the first meeting of the PSAP Manager’s Group, which will be held on November 3rd and 4<sup>th</sup>. She feels this process will be a topic of discussion at the Manager’s meeting. Richard Taylor gave an overview of what he hopes to accomplish with this group. He is hoping to receive feedback from the Managers.

The Committee decided the next meeting will be held on November 12<sup>th</sup>, from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM.